



AUSA ISSUES

ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY
2425 WILSON BOULEVARD, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201-3385



THE ISSUE: The Department of Defense Homosexual Exclusion Policy

Introduction

America's Army is unique. It is an institution designed and trained to fight America's wars. It operates under a strict code of discipline and law. Its primary focus is on the mission.

The whole system is directed toward getting and keeping the people who best meet the Army's mission requirements. Policies are not intended as career opportunities for all who desire to serve. In fact, the standards differentiate so as to select those best adapted to leadership and skill requirements as well as to the military environment, and have excluded persons for a number of reasons, to include physical condition, academic credentials, and mental or physical limitations. It is not a determination of individual worth but rather a selection to best fit Army needs. To reiterate, this is not a matter of "discrimination," the term most often used, but it is a matter of differentiating those people who can best serve the military.

The homosexual issue has been cited by many as identical to the integration of blacks and women into the military forces. It is acknowledged that the Army has accomplished this exceptionally well. Homosexuals, however, pose a far more complex question. They are not defined by either race or specific gender but rather by sexual orientation and sexual practices. This can and will conflict with certain standards of society and the deeply held moral convictions of many individuals.

As pointed out by General Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, race is nonbehavioral while homosexuality is behavioral and the same considerations are not applicable to military service. The issues relating to gender are likewise not synonymous with those of homosexual integration. Recognizing the privacy requirements for men and women, separate housing, bathing and toilet facilities have been provided. Introduction of homosexuals into the units and barracks vastly complicates the problem, as discussed later in this paper.

The military is not only tightly organized and disciplined but also needs to maintain a strong sense of community. Individuals must live and work in close, often intimate, associations over long periods of time. The entry of publicly avowed homosexuals into the military requires both an understanding and acceptance which do not now exist. It could create a serious and divisive culture clash.

While we do not in this paper attempt to make final judgments on the profound decisions involved, we do feel an obligation to point out key issues to be considered in coming to these decisions.

It is important that a broader knowledge of the basic issues be clearly understood by the White House, by the Congress and by the body politic before a premature decision becomes the vehicle for the erosion of the finest Armed Force this nation has ever fielded.

The Association of the United States Army stands firmly in support of the ban against homosexuality in the Armed Forces. The following presents some of the principal reasons why we take this position. It also outlines some of the issues raised over recent months which require serious appraisal.

The military services exist for the purpose of defending the nation and protecting national interests with minimum loss of life. The admission of open homosexuals is potentially divisive within an organization whose strength is unity and teamwork.

- Units are a special segment of the military environment. They live, train and fight together. Bonding is important. Shared values are essential in their bonds, and inclusion of homosexuals could serve to diminish these values. It would be difficult for a publicly avowed homosexual to bond with and be fully accepted by the group. In the professional judgment of military commanders, such divisiveness would degrade unit readiness and impair the combat effectiveness of the team.

- Senior-subordinate relationships may be adversely affected. Military organizations operate in a disciplined and structured way and are hierarchial in nature, with clearly established channels for command and control. In such a framework, everyone knows who is in charge, but the system demands mutual senior-subordinate trust and respect in order to be effective. It is difficult to perceive an openly homosexual officer in a leadership role demanding and receiving the kind of trust and confidence needed from subordinates who find his or her life-style morally objectionable. This situation could not help but be erosive to effective control and discipline.

- Heterosexual animosity toward known homosexuals can cause latent or even overt hostility, resulting in degradation of team or unit esprit. While this animosity is unfortunate, it is a fact of society at large and cannot be changed by the military.

- Significant evidence exists that homosexuals, for whatever reasons, are at greater risk of contracting diseases (including AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases) that would affect their deployability and long-term service. (While this may only reflect past behavior and is not an intrinsic aspect of homosexuality, it is nonetheless of current and real concern to the military.) This becomes a unit readiness problem whenever an individual is physically unable to carry out his or her duties at full capacity or is not eligible for deployment overseas due to HIV or other infections.

Lifting the ban would immediately create complex administrative problems in the accommodation of homosexuals in the Armed Forces.

- Privacy is a real issue. Service requirements place many service members in close association, often in a status of prolonged forced intimacy (in barracks, aboard ships and in the field). Integration of homosexuals leads to a host of privacy issues such as the sharing of showers, latrines and barracks assignments.

- Added to the privacy issue is the question of accommodating homosexuals in military living arrangements — either troop billets or family housing. In the former, heterosexuals can be expected to object to sharing rooms, tents or bunkers with known homosexuals, thus confronting commanders with the challenge of either forcing cohabitation of heterosexuals with homosexuals or facilitating cohabitation of two homosexuals. This also raises the issue of violation of cohabitation laws.

- The military is a unique community. Most Army families, not unlike most other American families, would not find the homosexual life-style and behavior patterns acceptable for their family environment. Large segments of the military population live in close communities, either on military installations or in closely associated enclaves. Integration of homosexuals could be highly disruptive to family and community comity.

- Today issues such as fraternization, relationships between the ranks and conduct unbecoming members of the Armed Forces are all subject to definition and regulation for both homosexuals and heterosexuals. With homosexuals openly accepted, the problem is significantly compounded with a possible combination of male/

female, male/male, and female/female relationships. Rules, regulations and codes of conduct would have to be carefully crafted to cover these situations; the dilemma for the Army will be to redefine what behavior is acceptable and what is unacceptable within the institution.

The legal and regulatory complications are staggering.

- Homosexual behavior (sodomy) is in violation of the law in most jurisdictions. Military law, i.e., the Uniform Code of Military Justice, specifically prohibits sodomy and can be changed only by act of Congress. This raises the issue of whether one can actually separate (as President Clinton and others are attempting to do) the “status” — being a homosexual — from the “behavior” — that is, doing what homosexuals do. It seems most difficult to seriously draw that distinction since — when it comes to human sexuality — the act, not the attitude, is the defining reality.

- The status of homosexual marriages must be defined. Would they be accepted and would military chaplains be required to perform them? Military law generally adheres to state law where located. Some cities, including San Francisco and Washington, D.C., recognize such partnerships, but most jurisdictions do not. This clearly requires a national referendum.

- Determination would have to be made on how regulations relating to spouses and dependents (e.g., eligibility for military housing, dependent benefits, medical care, preferential hiring practices) would apply to declared partners of homosexuals in the military.

- If the current ban is lifted, the government must be prepared to cope with a number of lawsuits for either reinstatement or restitution of lost wages on behalf of homosexuals who were previously given administrative discharges.

- Lifting the ban would expose the Armed Forces to the full range of potential challenges with demands based on either civil rights or equity. Some of these will involve differentiation in assignments, promotions and schooling. The issue of quotas will surely surface.

- A challenge from heterosexuals can be anticipated relating to the rules for enlistment terms. Some will not want to continue in service after homosexuals are admitted and will request relief from service. The question to be answered is whether the enlistment contracts of those already in the service when the ban is lifted can be broken legally under these circumstances. Informal feedback suggests that a significant number would seek this option. It could also denigrate the great effort that has been made to attract a top quality all-volunteer force.

Military health care problems would be magnified.

- The promiscuous life-style of many homosexuals makes them more susceptible to sexually transmitted diseases, including the AIDS virus, hepatitis-A, hepatitis-B, syphilis, gonorrhea and a variety of lesser known venereal diseases. An increase in the number of homosexuals in the military service may well increase the medical costs.

- HIV testing is required of active and reserve members no less than every two years, or within six months of deployments or overseas assignments. This applies to all categories. Soldiers testing positive are not deployable, mainly because HIV positive soldiers may be unable to respond to a vaccine and are more susceptible to infections (readiness criteria). Additionally, all soldiers are expected to be available for blood transfusions in combat (the walking blood bank). This is of particular importance with respect to homosexuals because, as stated earlier, they have a higher incidence of infection. However, the HIV testing program is currently under attack by homosexual advocacy groups.

Homosexual behavior is contrary to the moral convictions of the vast majority of Americans, including Armed Forces personnel.

- The claim for minority status is predicated on the claim that 10 percent or more of the population (and of the military) is homosexual. This assertion is based on a discredited 1948 study by Alfred Kinsey, who polled large numbers of convicts and male prostitutes in his sample. A recent study by the National Center for Health Statistics suggests the real figure is less than two percent, the point being that homosexual preference or practice is not widely ingrained in American society.

- The moral dimensions of the issue cannot be ignored — American societal standards are clear from the statutes (Uniform Code of Military Justice and about half the state codes) which make sodomy a crime. The religious/moral dimension is clear from the long-established teachings of numerous denominations on the subject.

- The Armed Forces of the United States reflect the mores of our society. Altering military policy will not only affect the military community but, at the same time, have far-reaching consequences on society in general. It would seem that many would say lifting the ban is permissible as long as it does not involve them but would not accept it for their sons and daughters. Parents are likely to discourage their children from entering military service as well. Therefore, acceptance of homosexuals into the Armed Forces could discourage young people from entering service and cause widespread recruiting and retention problems.

Most nations either bar homosexuals from serving or place restrictions on those who are allowed to serve.

- Abuse and fear of recrimination seem to be subtle, but there are reports of ongoing problems in every nation which allows homosexuals to serve in the military. The Dutch did a study in 1990 after 20 years of permitting homosexuals to serve in the military and found it extremely difficult to have anyone come forward to admit that he/she was homosexual.

- Israel is cited by homosexual advocates as a place where homosexuals are satisfactorily integrated into the Armed Forces. In the Israeli Defense Forces, homosexuals are not allowed to stay in the barracks with the other service members; they are sent home each night. This is totally impractical for U.S. forces. Israeli homosexuals are also prohibited from joining elite combat units and in most cases simply are not accepted.

- The Germans readily admit that known homosexuals have little, if any, chance of advancement because of the deep-seated prejudice against their behavior.

- The performance standards expected almost exclusively of our Army (to deploy world-wide and to accomplish varied and complex missions quickly and efficiently) makes comparisons with other nations' forces of limited value.

Before proceeding to inflict such a drastic social change upon the Armed Forces of the United States, we need to get a thorough educated public sensing of the impacts of lifting the ban. We need to hear and understand the concerns of the people who would be most directly affected by this major policy change — the men and women who wear the uniform of this country and their families. Today they are universally concerned and deeply troubled by this whole matter.

It is vitally important that this question be thoroughly reviewed by Congress. Public hearings should be held and all facts considered. Public support or lack of support should be scrupulously evaluated. If implemented, this will be a wrenching social change and we are dealing with one of our nation's largest and most important institutions, the Armed Forces of the United States of America.



AUSA ISSUES

ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY
2425 WILSON BOULEVARD, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22201-3385



THE ISSUE: The Department of Defense Homosexual Exclusion Policy

The Association of the United States Army stands firmly in support of the ban against homosexuality in the Armed Forces for the following reasons:

The admission of open homosexuals is potentially divisive within an organization whose strength is unity and teamwork.

- Inclusion of homosexuals could diminish the shared values that are essential to bonding through which soldiers live, train and fight together. Such divisiveness would degrade unit readiness and impair the combat effectiveness of the team.
- An openly homosexual officer would not engender the trust and confidence needed from subordinates who find his or her life-style morally objectionable.
- Heterosexual animosity toward known homosexuals can cause hostility resulting in degradation of team or unit esprit.
- Homosexuals are at greater risk of contracting AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases that would affect their deployability and long-term service.

Lifting the ban would immediately create complex administrative problems in the accommodation of homosexuals in the Armed Forces.

- Privacy is a real issue. Integration of homosexuals leads to a host of privacy issues such as the sharing of showers, latrines and barracks.
- Many soldiers can be expected to object to sharing rooms, tents or bunkers with known homosexuals.
- Integration of homosexuals could be highly disruptive to Army family and community comity.
- The rules and regulations governing fraternization, relationships between the ranks and conduct of members of the Armed Forces would have to be carefully crafted. The dilemma for the Army will be to redefine what behavior is acceptable and what is unacceptable within the institution.

The legal and regulatory complications are staggering.

- Homosexual behavior (sodomy) is in violation of military law, i.e., the Uniform Code of Military Justice, which can be changed only by act of Congress. This raises the issue of whether one can actually separate the "status" — being a homosexual — from the "behavior" — that is, doing what homosexuals do.

- How would regulations relating to spouses and dependents (e.g., eligibility for military housing, medical benefits, preferential hiring practices) apply to declared partners of homosexuals?
- There will be the full range of court challenges with demands based on either civil rights or equity. Some will involve differentiation in assignments, promotions and schooling.
- Could the enlistment contracts of those in the service when the ban is lifted be legally broken under these circumstances?

Military health care problems would be magnified.

- The promiscuous life-style of many homosexuals makes them more susceptible to sexually transmitted diseases, including the AIDS virus, hepatitis-A, hepatitis-B, syphilis, gonorrhea and a variety of lesser known venereal diseases.
- Soldiers testing positive for the HIV virus are not deployable. Additionally, all soldiers are expected to be available for blood transfusions in combat (the walking blood bank).

Homosexual behavior is contrary to the moral convictions of the vast majority of Americans.

- Homosexual preference or practice is not widely ingrained in American society. The assertion that 10 percent or more of the population is homosexual is based on a discredited 1948 study which polled large numbers of convicts and male prostitutes. A National Center for Health Statistics study suggests the real figure is less than two percent.
- American societal standards are clear from the statutes which make sodomy a crime. The religious/moral dimension is clear from the long-established teachings of numerous denominations on the subject.
- This change in policy could easily discourage young people from entering service and cause widespread recruiting and retention problems. Similarly, parents are likely to discourage their sons and daughters from entering military service.

Before proceeding to inflict such a drastic social change on the Armed Forces, it is imperative that we gain a thorough public understanding of its impacts. It is vitally important that we listen to and heed the concerns of the people who would be most directly affected by this major policy change—the men and women in uniform and their families. Today they are universally concerned and deeply troubled by this whole matter.

It is vitally important that this question be thoroughly reviewed by Congress. Public hearings should be held and all facts considered. Public support or lack of support should be scrupulously evaluated. Before implementing such a wrenching social change, we must carefully consider its impact on one of our nation's most important institutions, the Armed Forces of the United States of America.



VIEWPOINT



*The following represents the personal opinions of the author
and not necessarily the position of the Association of The United State Army or its members.*

May 1993

HOMOSEXUALS AND UNIT COHESION

by

Robert Lee Maginnis

Senator Sam Nunn hosted hearings during the last week of March 1993 concerning the contentious issue of homosexuals in the military. His committee heard from cohesion experts.¹ These experts outlined cohesion's importance for combat readiness.

They indicated the military's business is to fight and win. It accomplishes this task by fielding well-trained and cohesive units. They opined that the introduction of openly serving homosexual soldiers will undermine the development and sustainment of cohesive units.²

This paper will examine the probable impact of openly serving homosexuals for unit cohesion. Before examining the specific detrimental impact, the paper addresses the significance of cohesion for combat units; how cohesion is developed; and how it is sustained.

First, cohesion is critical to combat effectiveness. Military experts from Clausewitz and Napoleon to Schwarzkopf have recognized the importance of cohesion. It causes soldiers to willingly expose themselves consistently to enemy fire and to fight to victory or death.

Cohesion is the invisible power behind the combat unit. French military theorist Ardant du Picq explains the concept: "Four brave men who do not know each other will not dare to attack a lion. Four less brave, but knowing each other well, sure of their reliability and consequently of mutual aid, will attack resolutely."³

Army historian S.L.A. Marshall further illustrated the significance of cohesion. He said, "I hold it to be one of the simplest truths of war that the thing which enables an infantry soldier to keep going with his weapon is the near presence or the presumed presence of a comrade."⁴

Individual bravery does not decide the battle, rather unit bravery (or cohesion) does. Cohesion is related to the confidence each man places in his leaders and comrades. It is the unity of effort in a fighting team.

According to British historian Lord Moran, “The secret of the awful power of the German Army (of World War II) is ... in a certain attitude of her manhood.”⁵ During that war the German army, on the average, inflicted three casualties on the allies for every two they incurred.⁶ This success is attributed to small-unit cohesion, mutual trust and confidence in leaders and comrades. It is a critical combat multiplier.

The high level of cohesion in the Israeli Army is a reflection of its society. That society has a common language, religion and strong sense of nationalism. Its army is able to defend itself through the use of highly cohesive units.

Israeli battle experience showed that soldiers who lacked cohesive bonds with leaders and comrades were more vulnerable to battle shock. Cohesive units were better able to endure the shock of combat and maintain effectiveness than noncohesive units.⁷

U.S. ground units in the Vietnam War did not have the same level of cohesion as North Vietnamese units, especially after the Tet offensive in 1968. The U.S. Army lacked vertical bonding—the need for soldiers to believe in their leaders and the purpose of their mission—and the horizontal bonding needed for soldiers to feel comfortable in a unit. This resulted in a total breakdown of cohesion on the unit level.⁸

Although the Argentines outnumbered the British during the Falkland War, and although their weapons and supplies were more than adequate, it became apparent that the Argentines lacked the will to prevail which is characteristic of cohesive, well-led units. This became even more apparent when, during negotiations for surrender, a main Argentine condition was that their officers be allowed to retain their side arms for protection against their own men. Argentine soldiers and officers did not have mutual trust.⁹

The U.S. Army studied the impact of cohesion for units involved in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. Units of six brigades were studied. Cohesion was found to be a critical variable affecting soldier handling of stress in combat.

Military history demonstrates time and again that a cohesive unit is more effective in combat than an equal force with less cohesion. There are examples of highly cohesive small forces destroying much larger forces with low cohesion.

Cohesion makes the difference on the battlefield. It saves lives. It is not just something nice to have. It is essential at all levels of the military organization!

Second, cohesive units are made from soldiers willing to subscribe to Army values and standards. The Army resocializes recruits who have generally congruent values, interests, attitudes and fundamental beliefs to accept the values and standards critical to becoming a soldier.

The recruit must hold the Army’s values and demonstrate them in performance of duties.¹⁰ A recruit must also accept standards which dictate the behavior that will or will not be tolerated.¹¹

Acceptance of common, explicit Army values and standards by soldiers reduces conflicts, decreases obstacles to communication, and improves unit competence. Commonly held values and standards among leaders and soldiers also make units less susceptible to disruption by external forces and contribute in large measure to unit cohesion.

Ideally, the military attracts only recruits with the following cohesion-building values: a willingness to sacrifice personal welfare for unit welfare; a desire to become part of a disciplined group; a sense of community obligation; and respect for authority. These elements form the basis for building cohesive units.

If recruits with incongruent values must be accepted, the socialization process will be more difficult and will require constant attention until military values have been internalized, not merely given superficial compliance. When not internalized, conflict results.

Another aspect of resocializing the recruit is the creation of a new identity. The recruit must discard his personal identity in favor of the group (unit) identity. He must willingly focus on the unit's activities and goals and not his own. The neophyte soldier becomes totally dependent on his fellow soldiers for completion of unit missions and for survival. This mutual dependence fosters mutual trust.

Resocializing recruits also includes the removal of the unsuitable. In the Army, a recruit is unsuitable who cannot obey orders — any orders — or who fails to inculcate Army values and standards, or who cannot withstand immense and searing mental and physical pressure. These people will not enjoy the confidence of their peers.

Nonconformity with the cohesion-building unit also includes membership in an informal interest group. Many times informal interest groups have a strong influence upon the soldier's commitment to unit goals, values and standards. Such informal groups were evident during the Vietnam War.

Such groups included "heads" (drug users) who contended with "juicers" (alcohol users); "hawks" with "doves"; "lifers" (career soldiers) with "U.S.s" (draftees); and African-Americans who contended with whites. Membership in one or more of these interest groups often degraded a soldier's loyalty to his unit. Serious problems arose when such groups acted contrary to unit objectives. These groups undermined morale and unit cohesion.

Other significant factors which affect soldier socialization and unit cohesion include wide divergences among soldiers in terms of age, cultural background, religious preference and sexual composition. These factors need to be resolved in favor of the unit. After all, the unit's effectiveness demands complete compliance and subordination of personal preferences.

In summary, soldiers who accept the Army's values and standards and subordinate personal interests to those of the unit become the building blocks that make cohesive units. Over time and through frequent contact, interpersonal relationships develop among soldiers and between them and their leaders. Eventually, these relationships become more important and more intense. These intense, personal relationships are the basic elements of unit cohesion. They explain the maturing trust, discipline, morale and confidence that are key underpinnings of cohesive units.

Third, cohesive units are sustained in peacetime by maintaining a high frequency of association among unit members by reinforcing unit boundaries through design of barracks, mess halls and day rooms. Units also provide other opportunities, such as clubs and athletic facilities, for soldiers to come together socially. Unit leaders encourage bonding and cohesion by creating a healthy “we-they” view through traditions, ceremonies and distinctive insignia.

Leaders support cohesion by actively discouraging soldiers from belonging to autonomous interest groups with possibly deviant norms. Such groups tend to polarize soldiers and therefore undermine cohesion.

Training plays a key role in the development of cohesive units. During peacetime the process of military training is designed as much to inculcate group cohesion and solidarity upon which fighting spirit depends as it is to produce an adequate level of technical or tactical expertise.

Soldiers best bond (and therefore become cohesive units) when their differences are minimized and common expectations and experiences are shared. They develop strong rules of behavior and expectations (group norms) about individual conduct on the basis of face-to-face relationships which become the immediate determinant of the soldier’s behavior.

The bonding of soldier and leader is also critical to the development and sustainment of cohesion. Soldiers bond with leaders they trust, especially leaders who deal effectively with dangerous situations. These leaders ensure this vertical bonding by demonstrating that they care about the soldiers’ personal lives, by evidencing professional competence and a degree of leader predictability, by ensuring effective leader-soldier communication, and by evidencing an ability to effectively train soldiers.¹² These factors relieve the soldier of anxiety, resulting in greater leader influence and control, and encourage the development and sustainment of vertical cohesion.

Another factor that contributes to cohesion is the role played by the supportive military family. Nearly half the Army is married. The importance of the morale and confidence among Army spouses and family members must be considered. The family can directly influence retention and support the cohesion-building process.

The sustainment of soldier bonds and unit cohesion requires careful nurturing. Soldier-to-soldier and soldier-to-leader relationships cannot be neglected. Unnecessary interruptions to these relationships potentially defeat unit cohesion. The introduction of circumstances or people with contrary aims undermines cohesion building.

In summary, cohesion must be developed and sustained during peacetime. It is constructed from groups of soldiers who inculcate Army values and standards. It is sustained by very personal and daily contacts with comrades and leaders. This process must be jealously guarded.

Against this background, then, it would appear that cohesion in Army units would be jeopardized by the introduction of homosexuals. The integration of openly homosexual soldiers will result in distorted bonding phenomena: bonds among homosexuals, bonds among homosexuals and heterosexuals, and bonds among heterosexual soldiers. This multiplicity of bonding defeats the

Army's need to foster cohesion in small units. The introduction of homosexuals will polarize small units — the cornerstone of combat effectiveness.

The recipe for the exact characteristics needed in individuals who, when put together, can achieve high levels of small unit cohesion is not totally validated. However, the experience of combat-seasoned military professionals indicates that people with certain behavior patterns will not contribute positively to unit cohesion.

The behavior patterns which most military personnel consider detrimental to the development and sustainment of cohesive units must be considered. The following scientifically-documented homosexual behavior patterns can undermine the development and sustainment of cohesive units.

First, homosexuals define themselves by behavior which many soldiers find repugnant. Their sexual behavior (sodomy) is also a violation of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Heterosexual leaders and soldiers who subscribe to the intent of the law will in large numbers reject the forced integration of homosexual soldiers. The forced integration of homosexuals will undermine the trust and confidence among unit leaders and their comrades. It will also jeopardize leader trust in the integrity of the civilian leaders who placed the military in a dilemma between the commander-in-chief and the law-giving Congress.

The typical heterosexual soldier possesses a value system from middle America which says that homosexual behavior is abnormal. These soldiers do not want to associate with homosexuals. Forced association with homosexuals will damage the soldier's confidence in the Army and unit leaders and foster greater distrust of homosexuals.

Second, homosexuals are by definition sexually attracted to people of the same sex. The potential for sexual competition among homosexuals in a unit may destroy mutual trust and engender suspicions among heterosexual soldiers.

People involved sexually with one another may be less than effective. Relationships that involve intimate activities can stifle individual objectivity by participants in the relationship. For this reason, married couples do not serve in the same units. Homosexual soldiers in the same unit who are openly or secretly involved sexually will lack the objectivity required in cohesive units.

Third, self-disciplined soldiers are an essential building block of cohesive units. Considerable scientific research suggests homosexuals are very promiscuous when compared to heterosexuals. This documented behavior pattern will raise suspicion about their personal discipline and their willingness to inculcate the discipline demanded by the profession of arms.

Fourth, homosexual men have trouble establishing male relationships characterized by mutuality and equality. This is attributed to an underlying feeling of masculine inferiority which becomes the basis of envy and resentment toward heterosexual men. Consequently, the homosexual has difficulty relating to other men as equals, due to this resentment and because of the heterosexual's sexual and romantic significance to the homosexual. Additionally, heterosexual men who possess power and authority over the homosexual become particular symbols of masculinity, which only

intensifies the homosexual's same-sex desire. These factors will inevitably affect the important asexual bonding among peer soldiers and among leaders and homosexual soldiers. There is also a significant potential for increased incidents of fraternization among homosexual leaders and subordinate soldiers. This can be more devastating than relationships among peers. The critical vertical and horizontal bonding characteristic of cohesive units will likely be compromised by the introduction of homosexuals.¹³

Fifth, there are potential and psychological consequences for heterosexual soldiers serving with homosexuals. The homosexual has a far greater probability of contracting sexually transmitted disease (STD) due to a promiscuous life-style. The heterosexual will be sensitive to this probability and the increased chance that a homosexual soldier may contract the deadly HIV. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) indicates that two-thirds of all HIV cases are in the homosexual community.¹⁴ This information alone will have psychological consequences for heterosexual soldiers. They will constantly be aware that contact with a homosexual's body fluids could result in exposure to the HIV. Soldier bonding will suffer.

Sixth, homosexuals recruit sex partners, by necessity, from the heterosexual community. Young heterosexual soldiers who have not yet fully developed their own sexual identity will be threatened by the presence of homosexuals. Additionally, older soldiers with children at home will be especially hesitant when dealing with homosexuals in family housing areas.

SUMMARY

Cohesion cannot survive in an environment racked by a lack of discipline, poor morale and distrust. Scientific studies indicate that homosexuals as a category of people evidence behavior patterns that will potentially undermine the social ingredients that contribute to the development and sustainment of cohesive units. Their presence may well polarize units.

The Army must maintain a hard and illiberal view of life and the world. It must prepare for the battlefield. It must stand ready, if need be, to die. It is, in essence, a national resource to be used by society. This resource is most ready when it has well-trained and highly cohesive units. Openly serving homosexual soldiers will undermine the development and sustainment of this now well-honed force.

ENDNOTES

1. The committee heard testimony on March 31, 1993 from COL William Darryl Henderson, USA Ret., Dr. David H. Marlowe (Chief, Department of Military Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research), and Dr. Lawrence J. Korb.
2. Marlowe and Henderson.
3. Ardant du Picq, *Battle Studies: Ancient and Modern Battle*, translated by John N. Greely and Robert C. Cotton (Harrisburg, Pa.: Military Publishing Co., 1947), p. 100.

4. S. L. A. Marshall, *Men Against Fire* (New York: William Morrow, 1947).
5. Lord Moran, *The Anatomy of Courage* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967), p. 61.
6. *Ibid.* The German victories on the Eastern front significantly contributed to this ratio.
7. Gregory Belenky, Shabtai Noy and Zahava Solomon, "Battle Stress, Morale, Cohesion, Combat Effectiveness, Heroism, and Psychiatric Casualties: The Israeli Experience," pp. 11-29. Cited from *Contemporary Studies in Combat Psychiatry*, ed. Gregory Belenky (New York: Greenwood Press, 1987).
8. William Darryl Henderson, *Cohesion: The Human Element in Combat* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1985).
9. Testimony by COL Darryl Henderson before the Presidential Commission on the Assignment of Women in the Armed Forces.
10. U.S. Department of the Army Field Manual (FM) 100-1, *The Army*, outlines four critical values: integrity, loyalty, duty and selfless service. It also outlines four soldierly qualities: commitment, competence, candor and courage.
11. Army standards of performance as outlined in Army regulations. Interpersonal relationships are outlined in Command Policy (AR 600-20), Standards of Ethical Conduct (Executive Order 12674), FM 22-100, *Military Leadership*, and more.
12. This is cited from testimony by Dr. David H. Marlowe, Chief, Department of Military Psychiatry, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, to the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate, on 31 March 1993.
13. Joseph Nicolosi, *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality* (Northvale, N.J.: Jason Aronson Inc., 1991).
14. "HIV/AIDS Surveillance," Division of HIV/AIDS, U.S. Centers for Disease Control, October 1992.



ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

2425 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA 22201-3385 • (703) 841-4300 Extn. 611

General Jack N. Merritt
United States Army (Ret.)
President

2 February 1993

THIS LETTER AND THE ENCLOSED ISSUES PAPER ARE FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND ACTION. COPIES HAVE ALSO BEEN SENT TO OTHER AUSA LEADERS, RETIRED GENERAL OFFICERS, AUSA MEMBER NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE GENERAL OFFICERS, CIVILIAN AIDES OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY AND AUSA CONGRESSIONAL CONTACTS. COPIES OF THE PAPER WILL ALSO BE SENT TO CONGRESS AND OTHERS.

President Clinton's pre-election announcement that he would lift the ban on homosexuals in the Armed Forces has now been slightly tempered by an agreement to continue present practice in most aspects until the Pentagon has explained the problems and modalities of lifting the ban. The President continues to assert that he is committed to removing the ban and that his decision will not change.

This issue is emerging as one of the most critical social debates of our time. It is far more than an equity question and it is bigger than just the military issue. Yet, if directed, it would impact on the social fabric and readiness of the entire armed forces.

When the issue first arose, public reaction was relatively mild. There were many who did not feel directly affected and it was shunted aside as merely an equity question. Only lately have the real concerns, particularly those of our service members who will have to live with the new policies, begun to surface.

Today, lifting of the ban is the single most troubling issue expressed by service people at all levels. They are seriously concerned about privacy, superior/subordinate relations, family relations and family values, unit cohesion and bonding, discipline, morale, standards of conduct, public health, and other important aspects of military service. The legitimate concerns of all people in uniform need to be heard and acknowledged.

Moreover, any consideration of lifting the ban on homosexuals in the Armed Forces must include a painstaking appraisal of the rules and regulations governing conduct as well as clarification of the many complex legal problems generated.

It is our view that the whole issue demands serious congressional review along with a thorough public debate on the matter. It is one on which all the people should be heard. That certainly includes those who wear the uniform of our Armed Forces and the people the Armed Forces need

to attract. Congress should fully inform itself concerning the complexity of the issue as well as the sentiments of those directly affected.

The U.S. military, which operates under a particularly strict code of law and discipline, is a powerful engine for change. The issue of homosexuals in relation to society at large is one that extends throughout the history of civilization and transcends the political and geographical boundaries of any single nation. To attempt to decide the issue for Americans by administrative directive and then enforce that decision through the force of military law and discipline inappropriately evades the difficult issues involved, particularly the potential impact on our military forces. The role of our military is to protect and defend the nation, not to serve as a laboratory for social change.

Over the coming months there will be congressional hearings and legislation which codifies this ban will be considered. I am asking for your assistance in contacting the appropriate elected officials from your state and district to uphold the current policy on homosexual exclusion pending a thorough review. I have attached an issue paper that summarizes the major issues and considerations that are frequently raised. Some of them may seem minor, others may seem susceptible to solution, others arguably reflect biases in society. But the point is that change, if it is to come, must occur first in the greater society, must consider the unique characteristics of the military and must be through the full working of the democratic process.

I hope that I can count on your support in this vital matter.

Sincerely,

JACK N. MERRITT
General, USA Retired
President